



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address, COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/586,529	05/31/2000	Colin Collins	02307O-111900US	6021	
	590 01/17/2003				
TWO EMBAR	AND TOWNSEND CADERO CENTER	EXAMINER			
EIGHTH FLOO			BORIN, MICHAEL L		
SAN FRANCIS			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1631		
			DATE MAILED: 01/17/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/586,529

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Michael Borin

Art Unit 1631

Collins et al.



		WIICIIae	BUILL	1631	- (		
_	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover shee	et with the corres	pondence addre	<u>                                    </u>		
	for Reply				 		
	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.						
- If the p - If NO p - Failure - Any re	ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In a date of this communication. Deriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	he statutory minimum of and will expire SIX (6) Me	thirty (30) days will be ONTHS from the mailin	considered timely. g date of this commun			
Status	2000 1000 adjustment. 366 37 CFN 1.704(D).						
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 13, 2	2002					
2a) 💢	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This act				•		
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pa	except for formal	matters, prosec	ution as to the	merits is		
Disposit	ion of Claims	10 44470, 1000	C.D. 11, 455 (	7.G. 213.			
4) 💢	Claim(s) 1-6 and 10-23		is/are	pending in the a	application.		
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)		is/are	withdrawn from	n consideration.		
5) 🗌	Claim(s)		is	s/are allowed.			
6) 🗶	Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 10-23</u>		is	s/are rejected			
7) 🗌	Claim(s)		is	are objected to	2		
8) 🗌	Claims	are su	biect to restrict	on and/or clock	ion romitions and		
Applicat	ion Papers			on ana/or elect	ion requirement.		
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	a) accepted o	r b)□ objected	to by the Evan	viner		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the dr	awing(s) be held in	abevance See	37 CED 1 05/a)			
11) 🗌	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)	approved b	)□ disapproved	by the Examiner		
	in approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to	o this Office action	ı <b>.</b>		TO EXAMINE		
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examir	ner.					
	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign pri	ority under 35 U.	S.C. § 119(a)-(d	d) or (f).			
	All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:						
	Certified copies of the priority documents have						
	and applies of the billouth documents have	been received in	Application No.				
	Copies of the certified copies of the priority doc application from the International Bureau the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	cuments have bed u (PCT Rule 17.2 certified copies n	en received in the (a)).  Interceived	nis National Sta	ge		
14) 🗌 🛚 A	acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic p	riority under 35 L	J.S.C. § 119(e)				
a) ∟	The translation of the foreign language provisional	application has be	een received				
Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.							
ttacnmen	tis)						
	of Destaurance of Dr	I) Interview Summary					
	netian Diaglanda on the control of t	Notice of Informal	Patent Application (PTC	)-152)			
	6 (s).	Other:					

Art Unit: 1631

**DETAILED ACTION** 

Status of Claims

1. Amendment filed 11/13/2002 is acknowledged. Claims 7-9 are canceled.

Claim 1 is amended. Claims 1-6,8-23 are pending.

2. Rejection of claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is withdrawn

in view of clarification provided by applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

3. Claim 1-3,5,6,8-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly define the metes and bounds of the

subject matter that will be protected by the patent grant. The claims as amended read

on genome from an individual with a disease. The term "disease" is vague and

unclear. The specification, although providing particular example of cancer, does not

define scope of conditions encompassed as "a disease", and one of ordinary skills in

the art would not be reasonably appraised of the scope of the invention, especially

since defining the term appears essential to distinguish the invention from the prior art.

As any condition can be considered a deviation from a reference condition of some

Page 2

Art Unit: 1631

sort, any condition is considered a "disease" condition in the absence of clear definition of the term.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 103.

4. Rejection of claims 1,3,11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Brosch et al. is maintained for the reasons of record and in view of the following.

In regard to the reference of Brosch et al., applicant argues that the reference fails to teach construction of BAC library from an individual with disease, sequencing of ends of genome inserts in BAC clones, and comparing BAC clones to a second genome. First, the rejected claims 1,3 do not recite BAC clones. In regard to claim 11, the reference does address BAC library; see title and abstract. In regard to "individual with disease", the library in the reference is obtained from tuberculosis bacterium. In regard to comparing to other genomes, the BAC library was "used in a comparative study to reveal polymorphisms" (see abstract). Further, applicant argues that the reference does not teach inserting fragments into vector, sequencing inserted termini. None of these limitation is present in the rejected claims.

5. Rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Brosch et al. in view of Alshtul et al. is maintained for the reasons of record. The primary reference

Art Unit: 1631

which has been discussed above, are used as representative references teaching end sequence profiling of a library of clones. Having obtained such information, one skilled in the art would obviously be motivated to determine whether said sequences have any physiological relevance, i.e., whether they can be identified in any known collection of polynucleotides, or, even better, in a full known genome. There are numerous computational methods of nucleic acid sequence comparison, BLAST method (described in Alshtul et al) being the best known.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Brosch et al. 6.

First, the claims, as amended, are drawn to test genomes obtained from an individuals with "a disease". As the reference points out that stability and fidelity of the clones in the BAC library represents ideal characteristics for identification of the genomic differences(see p. 2228, second paragraph) it would be prima facie obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to be motivated to use genome mapping, sequencing and comparative genomics as described in Brosch for various comparative genomics projects including comparing normal vs disease genomes.

Further, if there are any differences between Applicant's claimed methods and that of the prior art, the differences would be appear minor in nature. Although the

Page 4

Art Unit: 1631

prior art do not teach all specifics of amount and density of clones (as in claims 6,15-

18,19-22) or determining their frequency (as in claim 10,13,14), or potential

test/reference genome permutations (as in claims 3-5), or executing method using

such tools as automated sequencing and computer (as in claims 22,23), it would be

conventional and within the skill of the art to determine such parameters and usages

as a part of routine optimization which is within the skill in the art to which this

invention pertains.

## Conclusion.

7. No claims are allowed

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented 8.

in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP §

706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and

Page 5

Art Unit: 1631

any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing

Page 6

date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply

expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the 9.

examiner should be directed to Michael Borin whose telephone number is (703)

305-4506. Dr. Borin can normally be reached between the hours of 8:30 A.M. to

5:00 P.M. EST Monday to Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are

unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Michael Woodward, can be reached on

(703) 308-4028. The fax telephone number for this group is (703) 305-3014.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating the status of this application should

be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

PRIMARY EXAMINER

January 14, 2003

mlb